International Journal of Mathematics and Computer Applications Research (IJMCAR) ISSN(P 2249-6955; ISSN(E): 2249-8060 Vol. 5, Issue 3, Jun 2015, 75-80 TJPRC Pvt. Ltd.



#### LINE DOUBLE DOMINATION IN GRAPHS

## M. H. MUDDEBIHAL<sup>1</sup> & SUHAS P. GADE<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics Gulbarga University, Gulbarga, Karnataka, India <sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Sangameshwar College, Solapur, Maharashtra, India

#### **ABSTRACT**

Let G = (V, E) be a graph. A set  $D \subseteq V$  is called a dominating set if every vertex in V - D is adjacent to at least one vertex in D. The domination number  $\gamma(G)$  of G is the minimum cardinality of a minimal dominating set. A subset  $D^d$  of V[L(G)] is a double dominating set of L(G) if for every vertex  $v \in V[L(G)]$ ,  $|N[v] \cap D^d| \ge 2$ , that is v is in  $D^d$  and has at least one neighbour in  $D^d$  or v is in  $V[L(G)] - D^d$  and has at least two neighbours in  $D^d$ . The line double domination number  $\gamma_{dd}(G)$  is the minimum cardinality among all line double dominating sets of L(G). In this paper many bounds on  $\gamma_{dd}(G)$  were obtained in terms of vertices, edges and other different parameters of G, but not the elements of L(G), further we develop its relationship with other different domination parameters.

KEYWORDS: Line Graph, Dominating Set, Double Dominating Set, Double Domination Number

Subject Classification Number: AMS-05C69, 05C70.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

All graphs under consideration are finite undirected and loop-less without multiple edges. Let G = (V, E) be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E. As usual p = |V| and q = |E| denote the number of vertices and edges of a graph G respectively. In general we use 0 < X > 0 denote the sub-graph induced by the set of vertices X and X(v) and X[v] denote the open and closed neighbourhood of a vertex v, respectively. The minimum (maximum) degree among the vertices of G is denoted by  $G(G)(\Delta(G))$ . A vertex of degree one is called an end vertex. Also G(G)(G)(G)(G) is the minimum number of vertices (edges) in a maximal independent set of vertex (edge) of  $G \cdot \chi(G)(\chi''(G))$  is the minimum G for which G has an G-vertices (G-edges) colourings. A line graph G is the graph whose vertices correspond to the edges of G and two vertices in G-edges) colourings. A line graph G-edges in G-are adjacent. We begin with some standard definitions from domination theory. Let G = (V, E) be a graph. A set G-edges in a graph G-is called a dominating set of G-every vertex in G-edges adjacent to some vertex in G-edges in a graph G-edges and G-edges in a graph G-edges in a graph G-edges in a graph G-edges in a graph G-edges in G-edges in a graph G-edges in a graph G-edges in G-

www.tiprc.org editor@tjprc.org

76 M. H. Muddebihal & Suhas. P. Gade

every vertex in V[L(G)] is dominated by at least two vertices in S. Or a subset  $D^d$  of V[L(G)] is a double dominating set of L(G) if for every vertex  $v \in V[L(G)]$ ,  $|N[v] \cap D^d| \ge 2$ , that is v is in  $D^d$  and has at least one neighbour in  $D^d$  or v is in  $V[L(G)] - D^d$  has at least two neighbours in  $D^d$  and is denoted by  $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$ . In this paper, many bounds on  $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$  were obtained in terms of vertices, edges of G but not the member of L(G) Also we establish line double domination of a line graph and express the results with other different domination parameters of G.

We need the following Theorem to prove our further results.

Theorem A[1]: Let G be a graph with diam(G) = 2 then  $\gamma_t(G) \leq \delta(G) + 1$ .

**Theorem B[4]:** If G is a graph without isolated vertices and  $p \geq 3$  then  $\gamma_{ss}(G) = \alpha_0(G)$ .

**Theorem** G[4]: A non split dominating set D of G is minimal if and only if for each vertex  $v \in D$  there exist a vertex  $u \in V - D$  such that  $N(u) \cap D = \{v\}$ .

**Theorem D[2]:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \chi(G) \leq \Delta(G) + 1$ .

**Theorem E[3]:** For any connected (p,q) graph G,  $\left[\frac{diam(G)}{3}\right] \leq \gamma(G)$ .

**Observation 1:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, p-\gamma_{ddl}(G) \ge 1$ .

# 2. Upper Bound for $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$ :

We shall establish the upper bound for  $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$  in terms of the vertices of G.

**Theorem 1:** For any connected (p,q) graph G,  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \leq p-1$ . Equality holds for  $P_3$ ,  $C_4$ ,  $C_5$ .

**Proof**: Suppose  $D^d$  is a double dominating set of L(G). Then by definition of double domination,  $|V[L(G)]| \ge 2$ . Further by observation,  $p - \gamma_{ddl}(G) \ge 1$ . Clearly it follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \le p - 1$ . Suppose G is isomorphic to  $P_3, C_3, C_4, C_5$ . Then in this case  $|D^d| = p - 1$ .

In Theorem 2, the upper bound for  $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$  shall be expressed in terms of  $\gamma(G)$  and vertices of G.

Theorem 2: For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) + diam(G) \leq p + \gamma(G)$ .

Proof: Let  $I = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, ..., e_n\}$  subset of E(G) be the minimal set of edges which constitutes the longest path between any two distinct vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$  such that dist(u, v) = diam(G). Furthermore let  $D = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_i\}$  be any minimal dominating set of G and let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$  be the set of edges of G. Now by definition of L(G), E(G) = V[L(G)]. Let  $D^d = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_k\}$  be the double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \forall u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . It follows that  $|D^d| \cup dist(u, v) \le p \cup |D|$  and hence  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) + diam(G) \le p + \gamma(G)$ .

**Theorem 3:** For any connected (p, q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) \leq q$ .

Proof: Suppose  $H = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$  be the subset of V[L(G)] and  $\deg(u_i)$ ,  $\forall u_i \in H$  has at least two. Then  $D_1$  is subset of H form a minimal dominating set of L(G). Further if  $I = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$  be the set all end vertices in L(G) then  $I \cup H_1 = D^d$  where  $H_1 \subseteq H$  form a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Since V[L(G)] = E(G) = q, it follows that  $|D^d| \le q$ . Hence  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \le q$ .

**Theorem 4:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) + \gamma[L(G)] \leq p+2$ .

Proof: Let D be the minimal dominating set of G. Now in L(G), if  $F = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_k\}$  be the set of all end vertices in L(G). Then  $F \cup H = D^d$ , where  $H \subseteq V[L(G)] - F$  forms a double dominating set of L(G), such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Since each vertex in L(G) corresponds to the edges of G and each edge in G is incident to two vertices of G, it follows that  $|D^d| \cup |D| \le p + 2$ . Hence  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) + \gamma[L(G)] \le p + 2$ .

**Theorem 5:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) \leq p$ .

**Proof:** Let D be any minimal dominating set of G. Further let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$  be the set of all edges which are incident to the vertices of G. Now by definition of line graph, V[L(G)] = E(G). Suppose  $I = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_i\}$  be the set of all end vertices in L(G), then  $I \cup H = D$  where H

Subset of F, forms a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Clearly  $|D^d| = |I \cup H| \le p$ . It follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \le p$ .

**Theorem 6:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) + \chi(G) \leq p + \Delta(G)$ .

**Proof:** By Theorem 1 and by Theorem D, clearly it follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) + \chi(G) \leq p + \Delta(G)$ .

**Theorem 7:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_{ddl}(G) + \gamma(G) \leq p + \left\lceil \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \right\rceil$ . Equality holds for  $C_4$ .

**Proof**: Let  $B = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  be the minimum set of vertices which covers all the edges of G such that  $|B| = \alpha_0$ . Further D be a  $\gamma$ -set of G. Let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$  be the set of all edges of G.

Now by definition of line graph L(G), E(G) = V[L(G)]. Suppose  $I = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_k\}$  be the set of all end vertices in L(G), then  $|I \cup H| = D^d$  where  $H \subseteq E$ , forms a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . It follows that  $2\{|H \cup I| \cup |D|\} - |B| \le 2p$  and hence  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) + \gamma(G) \le p + \left\lceil \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \right\rceil$ . Suppose G is isomorphic to  $C_4$ . Then in this case, |B| = 2 and  $\alpha_0(G) = 2 = \alpha(G)$ . Clearly,  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) + \gamma(G) \le p + \left\lceil \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \right\rceil$ .

www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org

78 M. H. Muddebihal & Suhas. P. Gade

**Theorem 8:** For any connected (p, q) graph  $G \gamma_{ddl}(G) \leq \gamma_s(G) + \gamma_{ss}(G)$ .

**Proof:** By Theorem 12 and Theorem 13 the result follows.

# 3. Lower Bound for $\gamma_{ddl}(G)$ :

**Theorem 9:** For any connected (p,q) graph G,  $\left\lceil \frac{p}{\Delta(G)} \right\rceil \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Proof:** Let  $D = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  be any minimal dominating set of G and let  $F = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\}$  be the set of edges which are incident with the vertices of G. Now by the definition of L(G),

 $F \subseteq V[L(G)]$ . Clearly  $D^d = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\} \subseteq F$  in L(G) forms the double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Further, suppose  $C = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\} =$  be the set of all non end vertices in G, then there exists at least one vertex v of maximum degree

$$\Delta(G)$$
 in  $C$ , such that  $|D^d|$ .  $\Delta(G) \ge p$ . It follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \ge \left[\frac{p}{\Delta(G)}\right]$ .

**Theorem 10:** If every non end vertices of a tree is adjacent to at least one end vertices, then  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \ge p - m$ . Where m is the number of end vertices in T.

**Proof:** Let T be a tree. If  $diam(T) \geq 3$  and  $S = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m\}$  be the set of all end vertices of T with |S| = m and  $d(v_i) = 1, 1 \leq i \leq m$ . Let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\}$  be the edge set of T. Now by the definition line graph L(G), E(G) = V[L(G)]. Suppose  $I = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  be the set of all end vertices in L(G), then  $I \cup H = D^d$  where  $H \subseteq E$ , forms a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \geq 2 \forall u V[LG)] - D^d$ . Since for any tree T, q = p - 1, it follows that  $|D^d| \geq p - |S|$  and hence,  $\gamma_{ddi}(G) \geq p - m$ .

**Theorem 11:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma_t(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

Proof: Let  $v \in V(G)$  and  $\deg(v) = \delta(G)$ . Since diam(G) = 2, then by Theorem A the dominating set  $D, |D| \leq \delta(G) + 1$ . Therefore,  $\gamma_t(G) \leq \delta(G) + 1$ . Suppose for any connected graph with  $diam(G) \geq 2$ , again by Theorem A,  $|D| \geq \delta(G) + 1$ . Hence  $\gamma_t(G) \geq \delta(G) + 1$ . Now let  $D^d$  be a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \geq 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Again by Theorem A,  $|D^d| \geq \delta[L(G)] + 2$ . Clearly it follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \geq \delta[L(G)] + 2$ . Hence  $\gamma_t(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 12:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G_1\gamma_s(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Proof:** Let S be a maximum independent set of vertices in G. Then there exists a set  $S_1$  subset of S such that  $S_1$  has at least two vertices and every vertex in  $S_1$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $V - S_1$ . Hence  $V - S_1$  is a split dominating set of G. Therefore  $|V - S_1| \le |S|$ . Hence  $\gamma_s(G) \le \beta_0$ . Now let  $D^d$  be a double dominating set in L(G) such

that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Since E(G) = V[L(G)], and let  $S^I$  be a maximum independent set of L(G). Then every vertex in  $S^I$  is adjacent to some vertex in  $V[L(G)] - D^d$ , such that  $|N[v] \cap S^I| \ge 1 \ \forall \ v \in V[L(G)]$ . Clearly,  $|N[v] \cap S^I| \le |N[v] \cap D^d|$  it follows that  $\beta_0[L(G)] \le \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ . Hence  $\gamma_s(G) \le \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 13:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $\gamma_{\sigma}(G) \leq \gamma_{dol}(G)$ .

**Proof:** Let v be a vertex of maximum degree  $\Delta(G)$ . Then v is adjacent to N(v) vertices such that  $\Delta(G) = N(v)$ . Hence V - N(v) is a dominating set. Let D be a connected dominating set of G such that  $D \leq V - \Delta(G)$ . Therefore  $|D| \leq |V - N(v)|$ . Hence  $\gamma_c(G) \leq p - \Delta(G)$ . Now, let  $D^d$  be a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[v] \cap D^d| \geq 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . Also  $D^d \geq V - \Delta[L(G)]$ . Therefore  $|D^d| \geq |V - \Delta(G)|$ , it follows that  $\gamma_{ddl}(G) \geq p - \Delta[L(G)]$ . Hence  $\gamma_c(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 14**: For any connected (p,q) graph G,  $\gamma_{ss}(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Proof:** Let S be a maximum independent set of vertices in G. Then V-S is a strong split dominating set of G. Since S is maximum, V-S is minimum. Thus  $\gamma_{ss}(G)=\alpha_0(G)$ . Now let  $D^d$  be a double dominating set in L(G). Since E(G)=V[L(G)]. Let  $S^I$  be a maximum independent set of L(G). Then  $V[L(G)]-S^I$  is minimum and  $|V[L(G)]-S^I| \leq |D^d|$ . Clearly it follows that  $\alpha_0[L(G)] \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ . Hence  $\gamma_{ss}(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 15:** For any connected (p, q) graph  $\gamma_{ns}(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

Proof: By Theorem [C], a non-split dominating set D of G is minimal if and only if for each vertex  $u \in V - D$  such that  $N(u) \cap D = \{v\}$ . Therefore  $|N(u) \cap D| = 1$ . Now let  $D^d$  be a double dominating set of L(G) such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . From the above, if for each vertex  $v \in D^d$  then there exists a vertex  $u \in V - D^d$  such that  $N(u) \cap D^d = \{v_i, v_j\}$  for  $i \ne j$  and  $1 \le i, j \le n$ . Therefore  $|N(u) \cap D^d| = 2$ . It is clear that  $|N(u) \cap D| \le |N(u) \cap D^d|$ . Hence  $y_{ns}(G) \le y_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 16:** For any connected (p,q) graph  $G, \gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

Proof: Let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$  be the set of edges of G. Let  $D = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_k\}$  be any minimal dominating set of G such that for every vertex  $v \in V(G) - D$  such that  $|N[v] \cap D| \ge 1$ . Now by definition of L(G), V[L(G)] = E(G), let  $D^d = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_i\}$ ,  $1 \le i \le n$ , in L(G), forms the double dominating set of L(G), such that  $|N[u] \cap D^d| \ge 2 \ \forall \ u \in V[L(G)] - D^d$ . It follows that  $|D| \le |D^d|$  and

www.tjprc.org editor@tjprc.org

hence  $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{ddl}(G)$ .

**Theorem 17:** For any connected 
$$(p,q)$$
 graph  $G_r\left[\frac{diam(G)}{3}\right] \leq \gamma_{cldl}(G)$ .

**Proof:** By Theorem [E] and Theorem [16] the result follows.

## **REFERENCES**

- 1. Gangadharappa D. B. And A. R. Desai, Some bounds on Domination of a graph, J.Comp. and Math.Sci. Vol. 2(2), 234-242(2011).
- 2. F. Harary, "Graph Theory", Adison Wesley, Reading Mass (1972)
- 3. T.W.Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, "Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs". Marcel Dekker, Inc; New York, (1998).
- 4. V. R. Kulli, "Theory of Domination in Graphs", Vishwa International Publications, India, (2010).